



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

able bodied is supported in whole or in part by the labor of any woman or child, shall be prima facie evidence of vagrancy.

Sec. 5. All acts and parts of acts in conflict with this act, or any part hereof, are hereby repealed.—Passed May 19, 1917; effective June 19, 1917. (From Ohio Bulletin of Charities and Correction, Dec., 1917.)

Mother's Pensions in America.—In the midst of the greatest crises in American history, on the day in June last, when ten million citizens of the United States were registering for compulsory military service in the war, the attention of the entire nation was diverted to the search for a kidnapped baby.

The baby son of a Springfield, Missouri, banker had been carried off into the Ozark mountains and was being held for ransom. A thousand mountaineers were assembling to go out on the trail.

And yet little Lloyd Keet, the kidnapped baby, drew as much attention as the registration itself. In the news columns of the press his story shared equally with the accounts of the registration. Editorial writers devoted part of their columns to his case. It was a national sensation.

All of which merely shows how fundamentally and passionately all men believe in the sanctity of the child's right to its mother. A basic human instinct is outraged by the crime of the kidnapper. The law recognizes this and punishes that crime with the most drastic severity.

And yet the law itself has been for years guilty of kidnapping children. For no crime at all but because of the misfortune of poverty, mothers have been legally bereft of their little ones. Children have been kidnapped by the State, shut up, often practically incommunicado, in huge prison-like institutions. Not because their parents failed in love or duty. It was simply because they were poor.

But thirty American states have now redeemed themselves from this crime of violating a fundamental human instinct. They have established a Mothers' Pension system. Instead of paying an institution to care for the children of poverty-stricken parents, they now pay the mother herself to care for the children.

The phenomenal rapidity with which the Mother's Pension system spread over the country, once it had been outlined, is explained by the fact that it appeals to one of the deepest of human emotions, to the same instinct in men that made the case of the kidnapped Lloyd Keet rival in the news an event of world-wide importance.

In 1911 the first Mothers' Pension law was born. Previous to that time our American states had been saving children from poverty at home by sending them to charitable institutions.

The mothers' pension system is not merely a relief measure. It is a utilitarian system for the benefit not only of the individual directly concerned, but of society, just exactly as the public school is. In New York the law provides that the mother who receives a pension shall be told at the time that it is not a charity but a legal pension.

The result is that the degrading influence of receiving charity does not enter into the case. And the dignity and nobility of motherhood is preserved. The woman with her family about her remains a useful, honored member of society.

And the child likewise is directly benefited. The happiness of home life, its freedom for individual development is his. In the institution where, but for the mothers' pension system he would have been sent, growth, individuality and happiness are all stunted. It would seem unnecessary to argue this point were it not for the fact that society has in the past been so ruthless in breaking up the homes of the poor. Society treats almost as an axiom, when it discusses social systems, the sanctity of family life. The home is considered a foundation stone of our whole civilization. And yet in action, society has been continually guilty of violating the home, wherever poverty entered into the problem.

And this old system of relieving poverty-stricken homes by breaking them up was not even economical. New York City last year paid three and a half million dollars and individuals contributed an equal amount, to institutions for the care of 22,000 children. In the mothers' pension states last year ten million dollars was paid to mothers for the care of 100,000 children. It cost the State, in other words, 300 dollars a year to support a child in an institution and only 100 dollars a year to help the mother support her child at home.

More than 1,000 children in New York City will this year be taken out of institutions and restored to their mothers. Trial of the system in thirty States has proved it to be economical, humane and easily administered. In the larger cities it cost 5 per cent for the administration of the system, while it cost 76 per cent to administer charity.

Child poverty, producing defectives, delinquents, criminals and incompetents of all kinds, is one of the most wasteful evils in the community. Last year 800,000,000 dollars were collected from ratepayers to support institutions for dependents and criminals. The public schools themselves did not receive so much of the ratepayers' funds. By attacking child poverty with a rational system of mothers' pensions we go right to the source of one of the causes of the defective and criminal element in the community. Figures prepared by juvenile court officials in Chicago show nearly a hundred per cent efficiency for Mothers' Pensions as a preventive of juvenile dependency and delinquency.

A good mother is the best guardian of her children. Experience is that she very rarely abuses her trust, under the pension system; less than once in a hundred cases, statistics of the scheme show. The widow with children under 14 who needs a pension goes before the juvenile court, and, proving her need, claims her State pay for State service. She is now as much a servant of the State as a judge or a general. She must devote herself to her State work and do no other. Once a month she reports to the juvenile court. Inspectors, male and female, visit her, to see how she is getting on. If she is abusing her trust, she loses both her pension and her children.

Money paid for mothers' pensions returns to the public in the reduced cost of hospitals, police courts, jails and asylums. The system is a parallel to the public school system, and more than that, is necessary to it. It is folly to spend vast sums for public schools and try to educate in them children who are not properly fed, clothed and cared for at home. Child poverty is one of the greatest tragedies of the day, and the mothers' pension system destroys it.

Within ten years there will be no child poverty. No State will permit its children to go hungry or poorly clothed, and no State will tear children from their own mothers and turn them over to soulless institutions. No reform in history has swept over the land as fast as the mothers' pension system. In

the space of the last six years three-fifths of the United States embraced the scheme. It took the public school system ages to develop—by comparison.

Since I have been in England scores of audiences have thrilled and risen to their feet and applauded when I told my experiences in the workings of mothers' pensions. And I knew that though I stood there before them I was practically forgotten. Their tribute was not to any lecturer, but to motherhood. I had touched the deepest chord in their beings.

You have but to point out to people the facts—of which most of them are ignorant—the facts of how the State in the past has been breaking up families for the crime of poverty, and then the possibility of preserving the family by a just, sane, efficient and economical system of mothers' pensions, and you get instant and overwhelming appreciation.

Mothers' pensions are coming throughout the world, not because any one or two men go about preaching the merits of it, but because, once the idea is liberated, it grows and spreads of itself and soon has won over the whole community by the simple sanity and humanity of its fundamental principles.—Judge Henry Neal in *Juvenile Court Record*, Chicago, October, 1917.

Selection of Judges by the Bar.—"The question of the extent to which the nomination of candidates for judicial office should be controlled by the bar continues to be much agitated. In contrast to the views of Mr. Shelton heretofore commented on (*Law Notes*, July, 1917, p. 63), attention may be called to a recent open letter of Mr. Justice Hamer of the Nebraska Supreme Court, who said in part:

"Everyone knows that while the judges of the Supreme Court are honest and intend to do right, and that as a whole the result reached is generally the proper result, yet every lawyer of wide experience knows that on nearly every supreme bench there is, or may be, or has been, some judge with peculiar predilections, or unexplainable prejudices. Maybe he is nearly always in favor of breaking the will that is contested, maybe he is nearly always for the city or town that is sued, maybe he is nearly always against the railroad company in a personal injury case, and also against the packing house and against the contractor and builder and the manufacturing plant in all such cases, maybe he is nearly always in favor of the defendant in a criminal case, maybe he is nearly always for the insurance company when it is sued, or for the church or the lodge that is sued, and maybe he is for the big bank as against the little one, and maybe he is for any bank as against its customer.

"These are only illustrations. Whatever the peculiarity of this particular judge may be, the men who obtain his nomination and election have probably secured a bonanza in their business, if his peculiar leaning is in their direction. Therefore, when the lawyers recommend anyone, it is a pertinent question as to what particular line of the law business they are in. They are likely to know the predilections of many judges or their prejudices or tendencies, and they may succeed in making money out of the peculiar habit of thought of the judges instead of out of the merits of the cases tried. Even one judge on the court having strong prejudices in any direction is dangerous to the safe and orderly administration of justice. Most lawyers of money-making tendencies are likely to lean strongly in favor of the judge whose peculiar views enables them to make money."

"To this it may be answered that for every lawyer who favors a candidate because of his known predilections there will be another who opposes him for